arXiv:1703.01794v1 [math.AP] 6 Mar 2017

Global existence and asymptotic behavior of classical solutions for a 3D two-species chemotaxis-Stokes system with competitive kinetics

Xinru Cao
Institut für Mathematik, Universität Paderborn
Warburger Str.100, 33098 Paderborn, Germany

Shunsuke Kurima
Department of Mathematics, Tokyo University of Science
1-3, Kagurazaka, Shinjuku-ku, Tokyo 162-8601, Japan

Masaaki Mizukami*
Department of Mathematics, Tokyo University of Science
1-3, Kagurazaka, Shinjuku-ku, Tokyo 162-8601, Japan
masaaki.mizukami.math@gmail.com

March 7, 2017

Abstract. This paper considers the two-species chemotaxis-Stokes system with competitive kinetics

$$\begin{cases} (n_1)_t + u\cdot\nabla n_1 = \Delta n_1 - \chi_1\nabla\cdot(n_1\nabla c) + \mu_1 n_1(1-n_1-a_1n_2), & x\in\Omega,\ t>0,\\ (n_2)_t + u\cdot\nabla n_2 = \Delta n_2 - \chi_2\nabla\cdot(n_2\nabla c) + \mu_2 n_2(1-a_2n_1-n_2), & x\in\Omega,\ t>0,\\ c_t + u\cdot\nabla c = \Delta c - (\alpha n_1+\beta n_2)c, & x\in\Omega,\ t>0,\\ u_t = \Delta u + \nabla P + (\gamma n_1+\delta n_2)\nabla\phi, \quad \nabla\cdot u = 0, & x\in\Omega,\ t>0 \end{cases}$$

under homogeneous Neumann boundary conditions in a three-dimensional bounded domain $\Omega\subset\mathbb{R}^3$ with smooth boundary. Both chemotaxis-fluid systems and two-species chemotaxis systems with competitive terms are studied by many mathematicians. However, there has not been rich results on coupled two-species-fluid systems. Recently, global existence and asymptotic stability in the above problem with $(u\cdot\nabla)u$ in the fluid equation of the above system were established in the 2-dimensional case ([**14**]). The purpose of this paper is to give results for global existence, boundedness and stabilization of solutions to the above system in the 3-dimensional case when $\frac{\mu_i}{\chi_i}$ $(i=1,2)$ is sufficiently large.

2010*Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary: 35K45; Secondary: 92C17; 35Q35.
Key words and phrases: chemotaxis-Stokes; global existence; asymptotic stability.
*Corresponding author

1. Introduction and results

We consider the following two-species chemotaxis-fluid system with competitive terms:

(1.1)
$$\begin{cases} (n_1)_t + u\cdot\nabla n_1 = \Delta n_1 - \chi_1\nabla\cdot(n_1\nabla c) + \mu_1 n_1(1-n_1-a_1n_2), & x\in\Omega,\ t>0,\\ (n_2)_t + u\cdot\nabla n_2 = \Delta n_2 - \chi_2\nabla\cdot(n_2\nabla c) + \mu_2 n_2(1-a_2n_1-n_2), & x\in\Omega,\ t>0,\\ c_t + u\cdot\nabla c = \Delta c - (\alpha n_1+\beta n_2)c, & x\in\Omega,\ t>0,\\ u_t + \kappa(u\cdot\nabla)u = \Delta u + \nabla P + (\gamma n_1+\delta n_2)\nabla\phi, \quad \nabla\cdot u = 0, & x\in\Omega,\ t>0,\\ \partial_\nu n_1 = \partial_\nu n_2 = \partial_\nu c = 0, \quad u = 0, & x\in\partial\Omega,\ t>0,\\ n_i(x,0) = n_{i,0}(x),\ c(x,0) = c_0(x),\ u(x,0) = u_0(x), & x\in\Omega,\ i=1,2, \end{cases}$$

where Ω is a bounded domain in $\mathbb{R}^3$ with smooth boundary $\partial\Omega$ and ∂_ν denotes differentiation with respect to the outward normal of $\partial\Omega$; $\kappa\in\{0,1\}$ (in this paper we will deal with the case that $\kappa=0$), $\chi_1,\chi_2,a_1,a_2\geq 0$ and $\mu_1,\mu_2,\alpha,\beta,\gamma,\delta>0$ are constants; $n_{1,0},n_{2,0},c_0,u_0,\phi$ are known functions satisfying

$$0 < n_{1,0}, n_{2,0} \in C(\overline{\Omega}), \quad 0 < c_0 \in W^{1,q}(\Omega), \quad u_0 \in D(A^\vartheta), \tag{1.2}$$

$$\phi \in C^{1+\eta}(\overline{\Omega}) \tag{1.3}$$

for some $q>3$, $\vartheta\in\left(\frac{3}{4},1\right)$, $\eta>0$ and A is the Stokes operator.

The problem (1.1) is a generalized system to the chemotaxis-fluid system which is proposed by Tuval et al. [**33**]. This system describes the evolution of two competing species which react on a single chemoattractant in a liquid surrounding environment. Here n_1,n_2 represent the population densities of species, c stands for the concentration of chemoattractant, u shows the fluid velocity field and P represents the pressure of the fluid. The problem (1.1) comes from a problem on account of the influence of chemotaxis, the Lotka–Volterra competitive kinetics and the fluid. In the mathematical point of view, the chemotaxis term: $\nabla\cdot(n_1\nabla c)$, the competition term: $n_1(1-n_1-a_1n_2)$ and the Stokes equation give difficulties in mathematical analysis.

The one-species system (1.1) with $n_2=0$ has been studied in some literature. It is known that there exist global classical solutions in the 2-dimensional setting; however, in the 3-dimensional setting, only global weak solutions exist. In this one-species system with $\mu_1=0$, Winkler first attained global existence of classical solutions to (1.1), $\kappa=0$ in the 3-dimensional setting and $\kappa=1$ in the 2-dimensional setting ([**37**]), and also established asymptotic stability of solutions to (1.1) ([**38**]). Moreover, the convergence rate has been already studied ([**43**]). Recently, Winkler [**41**] attained global existence and eventual smoothness of weak solutions and their asymptotic behavior for the 3-dimensional chemotaxis-Navier–Stokes system.

In the analysis of the one-species case the logistic source can enhance the possibility of global existence of solutions. In the 3-dimensional setting, Lankeit [**19**] obtained global existence of weak solutions in (1.1) with $n_2=0$, $\kappa=1$ and with additional external force f in the fourth equation, and also derived eventual smoothness and asymptotic behavior. Even for more complicated problems, Keller–Segel-fluid systems where $-(\alpha n_1+\beta n_2)c$ is

replaced with $-c+\alpha n_1$ in (1.1) with $n_2=0$, logistic source is shown to be helpful for establishing classical bounded solutions. In the 3-dimensional setting, Tao and Winkler [**30**] established global existence and boundedness of classical solutions by assuming that $\mu_1>23$. In the 2-dimensional case, Tao and Winkler [**31**] also showed global existence of bounded classical solutions in the Keller–Segel-Navier–Stokes system with logistic source with $+rn_1-\mu_1 n_1^2$ for any $\mu_1>0$, and their asymptotic behavior were obtained when $r=0$. For more related works we refer to Ishida [**16**], Wang and the first author [**34**], Wang and Xiang [**35**], Black [**3**], the first author [**5**], the first author and Lankeit [**6**], Kozono, Miura and Sugiyama [**17**]. These results fully parallel to those for the fluid free model; we can find counterpart in [**20, 26, 29**].

On the other hand, the study on two-species competitive chemotaxis systems with signal consumption seems pending. We can only find related research with signal production in which the asymptotic behavior of solutions usually relies on some smallness assumption for the chemotaxis sensitivities (e.g., for the noncompetitive case ($a_1=a_2=0$), see Negreanu and Tello [**24, 25**], the third author and Yokota [**23**], the third author [**21**]; for the competitive case see Tello and Winkler [**32**], Stinner, Tello and Winkler [**28**], Bai and Winkler [**1**], Black, Lankeit and the third author [**4**], the third author [**22**]).

As mentioned above, the chemotaxis-fluid systems ($n_2=0$ in (1.1)) and the chemotaxis systems with competitive terms ($u=0$ in (1.1)) were studied by many mathematicians. However, the problem (1.1), which is the combination of chemotaxis-fluid systems and chemotaxis-competition systems, had not been studied. Recently, global existence, boundedness of classical solutions and their asymptotic behavior were showed only in the 2-dimensional setting ([**14**]).

The purpose of the present article is to obtain global existence and boundedness of classical solutions, and their asymptotic stability in the 3-dimensional setting. The main results read as follows. The first theorem gives global existence and boundedness in (1.1). In view of known results on logistic chemotaxis-systems, it is no wonder that an assumption on smallness of χ_1 and χ_2 related to μ_1 and μ_2 will be necessary in the considered 3-dimensional case.

Theorem 1.1. *Let $\Omega\subset\mathbb{R}^3$ be a bounded domain with smooth boundary and let $\kappa=0$, $\chi_1,\chi_2,a_1,a_2\geq 0$, $\mu_1,\mu_2,\alpha,\beta,\gamma,\delta>0$. Suppose that* (1.2) *and* (1.3) *hold. Then there exists a constant $\xi_0>0$ such that whenever*

$$\chi:=\max\{\chi_1,\chi_2\}\quad \textit{and}\quad \mu:=\min\{\mu_1,\mu_2\}$$

satisfy $\frac{\chi}{\mu}<\xi_0$, the problem (1.1) *possesses a classical solution (n_1,n_2,c,u,P) such that*

$$\begin{aligned}
&n_1,n_2\in C(\overline{\Omega}\times[0,\infty))\cap C^{2,1}(\overline{\Omega}\times(0,\infty)),\\
&c\in C(\overline{\Omega}\times[0,\infty))\cap C^{2,1}(\overline{\Omega}\times(0,\infty))\cap L^\infty_{\rm loc}([0,\infty);W^{1,q}(\Omega)),\\
&u\in C(\overline{\Omega}\times[0,\infty))\cap C^{2,1}(\overline{\Omega}\times(0,\infty))\cap L^\infty_{\rm loc}([0,\infty);D(A^\vartheta)),\\
&P\in C^{1,0}(\overline{\Omega}\times(0,\infty)).
\end{aligned}$$

Also, the solution is unique in the sense that it allows up to addition of spatially constants to the pressure P. Moreover, there exists a constant $C>0$ such that

$$\|n_1(\cdot,t)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}+\|n_2(\cdot,t)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}+\|c(\cdot,t)\|_{W^{1,q}(\Omega)}+\|u(\cdot,t)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}\leq C\quad \textit{for all } t\in(0,\infty).$$

The second theorem is concerned with asymptotic stability in (1.1).

Theorem 1.2. *Let the assumption of Theorem 1.1 holds. Then the solution of* (1.1) *has the following properties*:

(i) *Assume that* $a_1, a_2 \in (0,1)$. *Then*

$$n_1(\cdot,t) \to N_1, \quad n_2(\cdot,t) \to N_2, \quad c(\cdot,t) \to 0, \quad u(\cdot,t) \to 0 \quad \text{in } L^\infty(\Omega) \quad \text{as } t \to \infty,$$

where

$$N_1 := \frac{1-a_1}{1-a_1a_2}, \quad N_2 := \frac{1-a_2}{1-a_1a_2}.$$

(ii) *Assume that* $a_1 \geq 1 > a_2$. *Then*

$$n_1(\cdot,t) \to 0, \quad n_2(\cdot,t) \to 1, \quad c(\cdot,t) \to 0, \quad u(\cdot,t) \to 0 \quad \text{in } L^\infty(\Omega) \quad \text{as } t \to \infty.$$

The strategy for the proof of Theorem 1.1 is to derive the L^p-estimate for n_i with $p > \frac{3}{2}$. By using the differential inequality we can see

$$\int_\Omega n_1^p + \int_\Omega n_2^p \leq C \int_{s_0}^t e^{-(p+1)(t-s)} \int_\Omega |\Delta c|^{p+1} - C \int_{s_0}^t e^{-(p+1)(t-s)} \Big(\int_\Omega n_1^{p+1} + \int_\Omega n_2^{p+1} \Big)$$

with some $C > 0$ and $s_0 > 0$. The maximal Sobolev regularity (see Lemma 2.2) will be used to control $\int_{s_0}^t e^{-(p+1)(t-s)} \int_\Omega |\Delta c|^{p+1}$. Combining the maximal Sobolev regularity with some estimate for $|Au|^2$, we can obtain the L^p-estimate for n_i. On the other hand, the strategy for the proof of Theorem 1.2 is to derive the following inequality:

$$\int_0^\infty \int_\Omega (n_1 - N_1)^2 + \int_0^\infty \int_\Omega (n_2 - N_2)^2 \leq C \tag{1.4}$$

with some $C > 0$, where $(N_1, N_2, 0, 0)$ is a constant solution to (1.1). In order to obtain this estimate we will use the energy function

$$E := \int_\Omega \left(n_1 - N_1 - N_1 \log \frac{n_1}{N_1} \right) + b_1 \int_\Omega \left(n_2 - N_2 - N_2 \log \frac{n_2}{N_2} \right) + \frac{b_2}{2} \int_\Omega c^2$$

with some $b_1, b_2 > 0$, and show

$$\frac{d}{dt} E(t) \leq -\varepsilon \int_\Omega \left[(n_1 - N_1)^2 + (n_2 - N_2)^2 \right]$$

with some $\varepsilon > 0$. This estimate and the positivity of $E(t)$ lead to (1.4).

This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we collect basic facts which will be used later. In Section 3 we prove global existence and boundedness (Theorem 1.1). Sections 4 is devoted to showing asymptotic stability (Theorem 1.2).

2. Preliminaries

In this section we will provide some results which will be used later. The following lemma gives local existence of solutions to (1.1).

Lemma 2.1. *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^3$ be a bounded domain with smooth boundary. Suppose that* (1.2) *and* (1.3) *hold. Then there exists $T_{\max} \in (0, \infty]$ such that the problem* (1.1) *possesses a classical solution (n_1, n_2, c, u, P) fulfilling*

$$\begin{aligned}
&n_1, n_2 \in C(\overline{\Omega} \times [0, T_{\max})) \cap C^{2,1}(\overline{\Omega} \times (0, T_{\max})),\\
&c \in C(\overline{\Omega} \times [0, T_{\max})) \cap C^{2,1}(\overline{\Omega} \times (0, T_{\max})) \cap L^\infty_{\rm loc}([0, T_{\max}); W^{1,q}(\Omega)),\\
&u \in C(\overline{\Omega} \times [0, T_{\max})) \cap C^{2,1}(\overline{\Omega} \times (0, T_{\max})) \cap L^\infty_{\rm loc}([0, T_{\max}); D(A^\vartheta)),\\
&n_1, n_2 > 0, \quad c > 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega \times (0, T_{\max}).
\end{aligned}$$

Also, the solution is unique up to addition of spatially constants to the pressure P. Moreover, either $T_{\max} = \infty$ or

$$\limsup_{t \nearrow T_{\max}} (\|n_1(\cdot,t)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} + \|n_2(\cdot,t)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} + \|c(\cdot,t)\|_{W^{1,q}(\Omega)} + \|A^\vartheta u(\cdot,t)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}) = \infty.$$

Proof. The proof of local existence of classical solutions to (1.1) is based on a standard contraction mapping argument, which can be found in [**37**]. Accordingly, the maximum principle is applied to yield $n_1, n_2 > 0$ and $c > 0$ in $\Omega \times (0, T_{\max})$. □

Given all $s_0 \in (0, T_{\max})$, from the regularity properties we see that

$$c(\cdot, s_0) \in C^2(\overline{\Omega}) \quad \text{with} \quad \partial_\nu c(\cdot, s_0) = 0 \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega.$$

In particular, there exists $M = M(s_0) > 0$ such that

$$\|c(\cdot, s_0)\|_{W^{2,\infty}(\Omega)} \le M$$

(see e.g., [**42**]).

The following lemma is referred to as a variation of the maximal Sobolev regularity (see [**13**, Theorem 3.1]), which is important to prove Theorem 1.1.

Lemma 2.2. *Let $s_0 \in (0, T_{\max})$. Then for all $p > 1$ there exists a constant $C_1 = C_1(p) > 0$ such that*

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{s_0}^t \int_\Omega e^{ps} |\Delta c|^p \le C_1 \int_{s_0}^t \int_\Omega e^{ps} |2c - (\alpha n_1 + \beta n_2)c - u \cdot \nabla c|^p\\
+ C_1 e^{ps_0} (\|c(\cdot, s_0)\|^p_{L^p(\Omega)} + \|\Delta c(\cdot, s_0)\|^p_{L^p(\Omega)})
\end{aligned}$$

holds for all $t \in (s_0, T_{\max})$.

Proof. Let $s_0 \in (0, T_{\max})$ and let $t \in (s_0, T_{\max})$. We rewrite the third equation as

$$c_t = (\Delta - 1)c - c + \big(2c - (\alpha n_1 + \beta n_2)c\big) - u \cdot \nabla c,$$

and use the transformation $\widetilde{c}(\cdot,s) = e^s c(\cdot,s)$, $s \in (s_0,t)$. Then $\widetilde{c}$ satisfies

$$\begin{cases} \widetilde{c}_t = (\Delta - 1)\widetilde{c} + f, & x \in \Omega,\ s \in (s_0,t), \\ \partial_\nu \widetilde{c} = 0, & x \in \partial\Omega,\ s \in (s_0,t), \\ \widetilde{c}(\cdot,s_0) = e^{s_0} c(\cdot,s_0) \in W^{2,p}(\Omega), & x \in \Omega, \end{cases}$$

where

$$f := e^s(2c - (\alpha n_1 + \beta n_2)c - u \cdot \nabla c) \in L^p(s_0,t;L^p(\Omega)).$$

Therefore an application of the maximal Sobolev regularity [**13**, Theorem 3.1] to $\widetilde{c}$ implies this lemma. □

3. Boundedness. Proof of Theorem 1.1

In this section we will prove Theorem 1.1 by preparing a series of lemmas.

Lemma 3.1. *There exists a constant $C_2 > 0$ such that*

$$\int_\Omega n_i(\cdot,t) \le C_2$$

for all $t \in (0,T_{\max})$ for $i = 1,2$.

Proof. The same argument as in the proof of [**14**, Lemma 3.1] implies this lemma. □

Lemma 3.2. *The function $t \mapsto \|c(\cdot,t)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}$ is nonincreasing. In particular,*

$$\|c(\cdot,t)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \le \|c_0\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}$$

holds for all $t \in (0,T_{\max})$.

Proof. We can prove this lemma by applying the maximum principle to the third equation in (1.1). □

Lemma 3.3. *For $r \in (1,3)$ there exists a constant $C_3 = C_3(r) > 0$ such that*

$$\|u(\cdot,t)\|_{L^r(\Omega)} \le C_3$$

for all $t \in (0,T_{\max})$.

Proof. From the well-known Neumann heat semigroup estimates together with Lemma 3.1 we can obtain the L^r-estimate for u with $r \in (1,3)$ (for more details, see [**39**, Corollary 3.4]). □

Now we fix $s_0 \in (0,T_{\max}) \cap (0,1]$. The proofs of the following two lemmas are based on the methods in [**42**, Lemma 3.1].

Lemma 3.4. *For all $p > 1$, $\varepsilon > 0$ and $\ell > 0$ there exists a constant $C_4 = C_4(p) > 0$ such that*

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{p}\int_\Omega n_1^p(\cdot,t) + \frac{1}{p}\int_\Omega n_2^p(\cdot,t) \\
&\le -(\mu-\varepsilon-\ell)e^{-(p+1)t}\int_{s_0}^t e^{(p+1)s}\Big(\int_\Omega n_1^{p+1} + \int_\Omega n_2^{p+1}\Big) \\
&\quad + C_4\ell^{-p}\chi^{p+1}e^{-(p+1)t}\int_{s_0}^t e^{(p+1)s}\int_\Omega |\Delta c|^{p+1} + C_4
\end{aligned}$$

for all $t \in (s_0, T_{\max})$, where $\mu = \min\{\mu_1, \mu_2\}$, $\chi = \max\{\chi_1, \chi_2\}$.

Proof. Let $p > 1$. Multiplying the first equation in (1.1) by n_1^{p-1} and integrating it over Ω, we see that

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{p}\frac{d}{dt}\int_\Omega n_1^p = -\frac{1}{p}\int_\Omega u\cdot\nabla n_1^p + \int_\Omega n_1^{p-1}\Delta n_1 + \chi_1\frac{p-1}{p}\int_\Omega \nabla n_1^p\cdot\nabla c \\
+ \mu_1\int_\Omega n_1^p - \mu_1\int_\Omega n_1^{p+1} - a_1\mu_1\int_\Omega n_1^p n_2.
\end{aligned}$$

Noting from $\nabla\cdot u = 0$ in $\Omega\times(0,T_{\max})$ that $\int_\Omega u\cdot\nabla n_1^p = -\int_\Omega(\nabla\cdot u)n_1^p = 0$, we obtain from integration by parts and nonnegativity of n_1, n_2 that

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{p}\frac{d}{dt}\int_\Omega n_1^p &= -(p-1)\int_\Omega n_1^{p-2}|\nabla n_1|^2 - \chi_1\frac{p-1}{p}\int_\Omega n_1^p\Delta c + \mu_1\int_\Omega n_1^p - \mu_1\int_\Omega n_1^{p+1} \\
&\quad - a_1\mu_1\int_\Omega n_1^p n_2 \\
&\le -\chi_1\frac{p-1}{p}\int_\Omega n_1^p\Delta c + \mu_1\int_\Omega n_1^p - \mu_1\int_\Omega n_1^{p+1} \\
&= -\frac{p+1}{p}\int_\Omega n_1^p - \chi_1\frac{p-1}{p}\int_\Omega n_1^p\Delta c + \Big(\mu_1 + \frac{p+1}{p}\Big)\int_\Omega n_1^p - \mu_1\int_\Omega n_1^{p+1}.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.1}$$

Now we let $\varepsilon > 0$ and $\ell > 0$. By the Young inequality there exists a constant $C_5 = C_5(\mu_1,\varepsilon,p) > 0$ such that

$$\Big(\mu_1 + \frac{p+1}{p}\Big)\int_\Omega n_1^p \le \varepsilon\int_\Omega n_1^{p+1} + C_5. \tag{3.2}$$

Moreover, the second term on the right-hand side of (3.1) can be estimated as

$$-\chi_1\frac{p-1}{p}\int_\Omega n_1^p\Delta c \le \chi_1\int_\Omega n_1^p|\Delta c| \le \ell\int_\Omega n_1^{p+1} + C_6\ell^{-p}\chi_1^{p+1}\int_\Omega |\Delta c|^{p+1} \tag{3.3}$$

with some $C_6 = C_6(p) > 0$. Hence we derive from (3.1), (3.2) and (3.3) that

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{p}\frac{d}{dt}\int_\Omega n_1^p + \frac{p+1}{p}\int_\Omega n_1^p &\le -(\mu_1-\varepsilon-\ell)\int_\Omega n_1^{p+1} \\
&\quad + C_6\ell^{-p}\chi_1^{p+1}\int_\Omega |\Delta c|^{p+1} + C_5.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore there exists $C_7 = C_7(\mu_1, \varepsilon, p, |\Omega|, s_0) > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}(3.4)\qquad \frac{1}{p}\int_\Omega n_1^p(\cdot,t) &\le e^{-(p+1)(t-s_0)}\frac{1}{p}\int_\Omega n_1^p(\cdot,s_0) - (\mu_1-\varepsilon-\ell)\int_{s_0}^t e^{-(p+1)(t-s)}\int_\Omega n_1^{p+1}\\ &\quad + C_6\ell^{-p}\chi_1^{p+1}\int_{s_0}^t e^{-(p+1)(t-s)}\int_\Omega |\Delta c|^{p+1} + C_5\int_{s_0}^t e^{-(p+1)(t-s)}\\ &\le -(\mu_1-\varepsilon-\ell)e^{-(p+1)t}\int_{s_0}^t e^{(p+1)s}\int_\Omega n_1^{p+1}\\ &\quad + C_6\ell^{-p}\chi_1^{p+1}e^{-(p+1)t}\int_{s_0}^t e^{(p+1)s}\int_\Omega |\Delta c|^{p+1} + C_7\end{aligned}$$

for each $t \in (s_0, T_{\max})$. Similarly, we see that

$$\begin{aligned}(3.5)\qquad \frac{1}{p}\int_\Omega n_2^p(\cdot,t) &\le -(\mu_2-\varepsilon-\ell)e^{-(p+1)t}\int_{s_0}^t e^{(p+1)s}\int_\Omega n_2^{p+1}\\ &\quad + C_6\ell^{-p}\chi_2^{p+1}e^{-(p+1)t}\int_{s_0}^t e^{(p+1)s}\int_\Omega |\Delta c|^{p+1} + C_8\end{aligned}$$

with some $C_8 = C_8(\mu_2, \varepsilon, p, |\Omega|, s_0) > 0$. Thus from (3.4) and (3.5) we have that there exists $C_9 = C_9(\mu, \varepsilon, p, |\Omega|, s_0) > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{1}{p}\int_\Omega n_1^p(\cdot,t) + \frac{1}{p}\int_\Omega n_2^p(\cdot,t)\\ &\le -(\mu-\varepsilon-\ell)e^{-(p+1)t}\int_{s_0}^t e^{(p+1)s}\Big(\int_\Omega n_1^{p+1} + \int_\Omega n_2^{p+1}\Big)\\ &\quad + 2C_6\ell^{-p}\chi^{p+1}e^{-(p+1)t}\int_{s_0}^t e^{(p+1)s}\int_\Omega |\Delta c|^{p+1} + C_9,\end{aligned}$$

where $\mu = \min\{\mu_1, \mu_2\}$ and $\chi = \max\{\chi_1, \chi_2\}$. □

Lemma 3.5. *For all $p \in (1,2)$ there exists a constant $C_{10} = C_{10}(p) > 0$ such that*

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_{s_0}^t e^{(p+1)s}\int_\Omega |\Delta c|^{p+1}\\ &\le C_{10}\int_{s_0}^t e^{(p+1)s}(\|n_1\|_{L^{p+1}(\Omega)}^{p+1} + \|n_2\|_{L^{p+1}(\Omega)}^{p+1}) + C_{10}\int_{s_0}^t e^{(p+1)s}\|Au\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2\,ds\\ &\quad + C_{10}e^{(p+1)t} + C_{10}\end{aligned}$$

for all $t \in (s_0, T_{\max})$.

Proof. Fix $\theta \in (1,2)$ and put $\theta' = \frac{\theta}{\theta-1}$. We derive from Lemma 2.2 that

$$\begin{aligned}(3.6)\qquad \int_{s_0}^t e^{(p+1)s}\int_\Omega |\Delta c|^{p+1} &\le C_{11}\int_{s_0}^t e^{(p+1)s}\int_\Omega |2c - (\alpha n_1 + \beta n_2)c - u\cdot\nabla c|^{p+1}\\ &\quad + C_{11}e^{(p+1)s_0}\|c(\cdot,s_0)\|_{W^{2,p+1}(\Omega)}^{p+1}\end{aligned}$$

holds with some $C_{11} = C_{11}(p) > 0$. Lemma 3.2 and the Hölder inequality imply

$$
\begin{aligned}
(3.7)\qquad & \int_{s_0}^{t} e^{(p+1)s} \int_\Omega |2c - (\alpha n_1 + \beta n_2)c - u \cdot \nabla c|^{p+1} \\
& \le C_{12} \int_{s_0}^{t} e^{(p+1)s} \int_\Omega (n_1^{p+1} + n_2^{p+1} + |u \cdot \nabla c|^{p+1}) + C_{12} e^{(p+1)t} \\
& \le C_{12} \int_{s_0}^{t} e^{(p+1)s} \Big(\|n_1\|_{L^{p+1}(\Omega)}^{p+1} + \|n_2\|_{L^{p+1}(\Omega)}^{p+1} + \|u\|_{L^{(p+1)\theta}(\Omega)}^{p+1} \|\nabla c\|_{L^{(p+1)\theta'}(\Omega)}^{p+1} \Big) \\
& \quad + C_{12} e^{(p+1)t}
\end{aligned}
$$

with some $C_{12} = C_{12}(p) > 0$. Here we see from the Gagliardo–Nirenberg inequality and Lemma 3.2 that there exist constants $C_{13} = C_{13}(p), C_{14} = C_{14}(p) > 0$ such that

$$
\begin{aligned}
(3.8)\qquad \|\nabla c\|_{L^{(p+1)\theta'}(\Omega)}^{p+1} &\le C_{13} \|\Delta c\|_{L^{p+1}(\Omega)}^{a(p+1)} \|c\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}^{(1-a)(p+1)} + C_{13} \|c\|_{L^1(\Omega)}^{p+1} \\
&\le C_{14} \|\Delta c\|_{L^{p+1}(\Omega)}^{a(p+1)} + C_{14}
\end{aligned}
$$

with $a := \frac{1 - \frac{3}{(p+1)\theta'}}{2 - \frac{3}{p+1}} \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1)$. By (3.6), (3.7), (3.8) and the Young inequality it holds that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\int_{s_0}^{t} e^{(p+1)s} \int_\Omega |\Delta c|^{p+1} &\le C_{15} \int_{s_0}^{t} e^{(p+1)s} (\|n_1\|_{L^{p+1}(\Omega)}^{p+1} + \|n_2\|_{L^{p+1}(\Omega)}^{p+1}) \\
&\quad + a \int_{s_0}^{t} e^{(p+1)s} \|\Delta c\|_{L^{p+1}(\Omega)}^{p+1} + C_{15} \int_{s_0}^{t} e^{(p+1)s} \|u\|_{L^{(p+1)\theta}(\Omega)}^{\frac{p+1}{1-a}} \\
&\quad + C_{15} \int_{s_0}^{t} e^{(p+1)s} \|u\|_{L^{(p+1)\theta}(\Omega)}^{p+1} + C_{15} e^{(p+1)t} + C_{15}
\end{aligned}
$$

with some $C_{15} = C_{15}(p) > 0$. Here we use $p < 2$, which namely enable us to pick $r \in (1, 3)$ such that

$$
(3.9)\qquad \frac{2 - \frac{3}{p+1}}{1 - \frac{3}{(p+1)\theta}} \cdot (p+1) \cdot \frac{\frac{3}{r} - \frac{3}{(p+1)\theta}}{\frac{1}{2} + \frac{3}{r}} < 2
$$

holds. Therefore we can obtain that

$$
\begin{aligned}
(3.10)\qquad & \int_{s_0}^{t} e^{(p+1)s} \int_\Omega |\Delta c|^{p+1} \\
& \le \frac{C_{15}}{1-a} \int_{s_0}^{t} e^{(p+1)s} (\|n_1\|_{L^{p+1}(\Omega)}^{p+1} + \|n_2\|_{L^{p+1}(\Omega)}^{p+1}) + \frac{C_{15}}{1-a} \int_{s_0}^{t} e^{(p+1)s} \|u\|_{L^{(p+1)\theta}(\Omega)}^{\frac{p+1}{1-a}} \\
& \quad + \frac{C_{15}}{1-a} \int_{s_0}^{t} e^{(p+1)s} \|u\|_{L^{(p+1)\theta}(\Omega)}^{p+1} + \frac{C_{15}}{1-a} e^{(p+1)t} + \frac{C_{15}}{1-a}.
\end{aligned}
$$

Now we see from the Gagliardo–Nirenberg inequality, Lemma 3.3 and the Young inequality that there exists a constant $C_{16} = C_{16}(p) > 0$ such that

$$
(3.11)\qquad \|u(\cdot, s)\|_{L^{(p+1)\theta}(\Omega)}^{\frac{p+1}{1-a}} \le \|Au(\cdot, s)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^{\frac{p+1}{1-a} b} \|u(\cdot, s)\|_{L^r(\Omega)}^{\frac{p+1}{1-a}(1-b)} \le C_{16} + C_{16} \|Au(\cdot, s)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2
$$

with $b := \frac{\frac{3}{r}-\frac{3}{(p+1)\theta}}{\frac{1}{2}+\frac{3}{r}} \in (0,1)$, since $\frac{p+1}{1-a}b < 2$ from (3.9). Similarly, there exists a constant $C_{17} = C_{17}(p) > 0$ such that

$$\|u(\cdot,s)\|^{p+1}_{L^{(p+1)\theta}(\Omega)} \le C_{17} + C_{17}\|Au(\cdot,s)\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} \tag{3.12}$$

for all $s \in (s_0, T_{\max})$. Therefore combination of (3.10) with (3.11) and (3.12) yields that there exists a constant $C_{18} = C_{18}(p) > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{s_0}^t e^{(p+1)s}\int_\Omega |\Delta c(\cdot,s)|^{p+1}\,ds \\
&\le C_{18}\int_{s_0}^t e^{(p+1)s}(\|n_1(\cdot,s)\|^{p+1}_{L^{p+1}(\Omega)} + \|n_2(\cdot,s)\|^{p+1}_{L^{p+1}(\Omega)})\,ds \\
&\quad + C_{18}\int_{s_0}^t e^{(p+1)s}\|Au(\cdot,s)\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)}\,ds + C_{18}e^{(p+1)t} + C_{18}
\end{aligned}$$

for all $t \in (s_0, T_{\max})$, which means the end of the proof. □

In order to control $\int_{s_0}^t e^{(p+1)s}\int_\Omega |\Delta c|^{p+1}$ we provide the following lemma.

Lemma 3.6. *For all $p > 1$ there exists a constant $C_{19} = C_{19}(p) > 0$ such that*

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{s_0}^t e^{(p+1)s}\int_\Omega |Au|^2 \\
&\le 2e^{(p+1)s_0}\int_\Omega |A^{\frac{1}{2}}u(\cdot,s_0)|^2 + C_{19}e^{(p+1)t} + C_{19}\int_{s_0}^t e^{(p+1)s}\Big(\int_\Omega n_1^{p+1} + \int_\Omega n_2^{p+1}\Big)
\end{aligned}$$

for all $t \in (s_0, T_{\max})$.

Proof. It follows from the fourth equation in (1.1), the Young inequality and the continuity of the Helmholtz projection on $L^2(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^3)$ ([**9**, Theorem 1]) that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{dt}\int_\Omega |A^{\frac{1}{2}}u|^2 + \int_\Omega |Au|^2 \\
&= \int_\Omega Au\cdot\mathcal{P}[(\gamma n_1 + \delta n_2)\nabla\phi] \\
&\le \frac{1}{4}\int_\Omega |Au|^2 + \int_\Omega |(\gamma n_1 + \delta n_2)\nabla\phi|^2 \\
&\le \frac{1}{4}\int_\Omega |Au|^2 + (\gamma^2+\delta^2)\|\nabla\phi\|^2_{L^\infty(\Omega)}\Big(\int_\Omega n_1^2 + \int_\Omega n_2^2\Big) \\
&\le \frac{1}{4}\int_\Omega |Au|^2 + (\gamma^2+\delta^2)\|\nabla\phi\|^2_{L^\infty(\Omega)}\Big(2|\Omega| + \int_\Omega n_1^{p+1} + \int_\Omega n_2^{p+1}\Big),
\end{aligned}$$

and hence there exists a constant $C_{20} > 0$ such that

$$\frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{dt}\int_\Omega |A^{\frac{1}{2}}u|^2 + \frac{3}{4}\int_\Omega |Au|^2 \le C_{20} + C_{20}\Big(\int_\Omega n_1^{p+1} + \int_\Omega n_2^{p+1}\Big) \tag{3.13}$$

and we derive from [**7**, Part2, Theorem 14.1], Lemma 3.3 and the Young inequality that

$$\int_\Omega |A^{\frac{1}{2}}u|^2 \le C_{21}\|Au(\cdot,s)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\|u\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \le C_{22} + \frac{1}{(p+1)}\|Au(\cdot,s)\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} \tag{3.14}$$

with some constants $C_{21}, C_{22} > 0$. By (3.13) and (3.14) we obtain

$$\frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{dt}\int_\Omega |A^{\frac{1}{2}}u|^2 + \frac{p+1}{2}\int_\Omega |A^{\frac{1}{2}}u|^2 + \frac{1}{4}\int_\Omega |Au|^2 \le C_{23} + C_{23}\Big(\int_\Omega n_1^{p+1} + \int_\Omega n_2^{p+1}\Big)$$

with some constant $C_{23} = C_{23}(p) > 0$, and hence we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_{s_0}^t e^{(p+1)s}\int_\Omega |Au|^2\\ &\le 2e^{(p+1)s_0}\int_\Omega |A^{\frac{1}{2}}u(\cdot,s_0)|^2 + C_{24}e^{(p+1)t} + C_{24}\int_{s_0}^t e^{(p+1)s}\Big(\int_\Omega n_1^{p+1} + \int_\Omega n_2^{p+1}\Big)\end{aligned}$$

with some constant $C_{24} = C_{24}(p) > 0$, which concludes the proof. □

Lemma 3.7. *For all $p \in (1,2)$ and for all $\ell > 0$ there exist positive constants $K(p) > 0$ and $C_{25} = C_{25}(p,\ell) > 0$ such that if $\mu > \mu_{p,\ell} := \ell + K(p)\ell^{-p}\chi^{p+1}$, then*

$$\|n_i(\cdot,t)\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \le C_{25} \quad \textit{for all } t \in (s_0, T_{\max})$$

for $i = 1, 2$, where $\mu = \min\{\mu_1, \mu_2\}$, $\chi = \max\{\chi_1, \chi_2\}$.

Proof. It follows from Lemmas 3.4, 3.5 and 3.6 that there exists a constant $K(p) > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{1}{p}\int_\Omega n_1^p(\cdot,t) + \frac{1}{p}\int_\Omega n_2^p(\cdot,t)\\ &\le -(\mu - \varepsilon - \ell - K(p)\ell^{-p}\chi^{p+1})e^{-(p+1)t}\int_{s_0}^t e^{(p+1)s}\Big(\int_\Omega n_1^{p+1} + \int_\Omega n_2^{p+1}\Big)\\ &\quad + K(p)\ell^{-p}\chi^{p+1} + K(p)\end{aligned}$$

for all $t \in (s_0, T_{\max})$. We assume that $\mu > \mu_{p,\ell}$. Then there exists $\varepsilon \in (0, \mu - \mu_{p,\ell})$ such that

$$\mu - \varepsilon - \ell - K(p)\ell^{-p}\chi^{p+1} \ge 0.$$

Thus we derive that

$$\frac{1}{p}\int_\Omega n_1^p(\cdot,t) + \frac{1}{p}\int_\Omega n_2^p(\cdot,t) \le K(p)\ell^{-p}\chi^{p+1} + K(p)$$

holds for all $t \in (s_0, T_{\max})$, which concludes the proof of Lemma 3.7. □

The proof of the following lemma is based on the method in [**42**, Proof of Theorem 1].

Lemma 3.8. *For all $p \in (\frac{3}{2}, 2)$ there exists $\xi_0 > 0$ such that if $\frac{\chi}{\mu} < \xi_0$, then there exists a constant $C_{26} > 0$ such that*

$$\|n_i(\cdot,t)\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \le C_{26} \quad \textit{for all } t \in (0, T_{\max})$$

for $i = 1, 2$.

Proof. Let $p \in (\frac{3}{2}, 2)$ and let $\xi_0 = \xi_0(p) > 0$ satisfing

$$\inf_{\ell>0} \mu_{p,\ell} = \inf_{\ell>0}(\ell + K(p)\ell^{-p}\chi^{p+1}) = \frac{1}{\xi_0}\chi.$$

Then we can see that $\frac{\chi}{\mu} < \xi_0$ implies $\mu > \mu_{p,\ell}$ with some $\ell > 0$. Therefore Lemma 3.7 implies that there exists a constant $C_{27} = C_{27}(p) > 0$ such that

$$\|n_i(\cdot,t)\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \le C_{27} \quad \text{for all } t \in (0, T_{\max})$$

for each $i = 1, 2$, which implies the end of the proof. □

Lemma 3.9. *Assume $\frac{\chi}{\mu} < \xi_0$. Then there exists a constant $C_{28} > 0$ such that*

$$\|A^\vartheta u(\cdot,t)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \le C_{28} \quad \textit{and} \quad \|u(\cdot,t)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \le C_{28}$$

for all $t \in (0, T_{\max})$.

Proof. Noting that $\frac{1}{2} + \frac{2}{3}(1-\vartheta) \in (\frac{1}{2}, \frac{2}{3})$, we can fix $p \in \left(\frac{1}{\frac{1}{2}+\frac{2}{3}(1-\vartheta)}, 2\right)$. It follows from Lemma 3.8, the well-known regularization estimates for Stokes semigroup [**11, 27**] and the continuity of the Helmholtz projection on $L^r(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^3)$ (see e.g., [**9**, Theorem 1]) that there exist constants $C_{29}, C_{30}, C_{31}, C_{32} > 0$ and $\lambda > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|A^\vartheta u(\cdot,t)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} &\le \|A^\vartheta e^{-tA}u_0\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \int_0^t \|A^\vartheta e^{-(t-s)A}\mathcal{P}[(\gamma n_1 + \delta n_2)\nabla\phi]\|_{L^2(\Omega)}\, ds \\
&\le \|A^\vartheta u_0\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \\
&\quad + C_{29}\int_0^t (t-s)^{-\vartheta-\frac{3}{2}(\frac{1}{p}-\frac{1}{2})} e^{-\lambda(t-s)} \|\mathcal{P}[(\gamma n_1 + \delta n_2)\nabla\phi]\|_{L^p(\Omega)}\, ds \\
&\le \|A^\vartheta u_0\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + C_{30}\int_0^t (t-s)^{-\vartheta-\frac{3}{2}(\frac{1}{p}-\frac{1}{2})} e^{-\lambda(t-s)} \|\gamma n_1 + \delta n_2\|_{L^p(\Omega)}\, ds \\
&\le \|A^\vartheta u_0\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + C_{31}\int_0^\infty \sigma^{-\vartheta-\frac{3}{2}(\frac{1}{p}-\frac{1}{2})} e^{-\lambda\sigma}\, d\sigma \le C_{32}
\end{aligned}$$

for all $t \in (0, T_{\max})$ since $\vartheta + \frac{3}{2}(\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{2}) < 1$. Moreover, the properties of $D(A^\vartheta)$ ([**10**, Theorem 3] and [**12**, Theorem 1.6.1]) imply that there exists $C_{33} > 0$ such that

$$\|u(\cdot,t)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \le C_{33}\|A^\vartheta u(\cdot,t)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}$$

for all $t \in (0, T_{\max})$, which concludes the proof. □

Lemma 3.10. *Assume* $\frac{\chi}{\mu} < \xi_0$. *Then there exist* $r \in (3,6) \cap (1,q]$ *and* $C_{34} = C_{34}(r) > 0$ *such that*

$$\|\nabla c(\cdot,t)\|_{L^r(\Omega)} \le C_{34} \quad \textit{for all } t \in (0, T_{\max}).$$

Proof. Let $r \in (3,6) \cap (1,q]$ and fix $p \in (\frac{3q}{q+3}, 2)$. An application of the variation of constants formula for c leads to

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla c(\cdot,t)\|_{L^r(\Omega)} &\le \|\nabla e^{t(\Delta-1)} c_0\|_{L^r(\Omega)} \\ &\quad + \int_0^t \|\nabla e^{(t-s)(\Delta-1)}(\alpha n_1(\cdot,s) + \beta n_2(\cdot,s) + 1) c(\cdot,s)\|_{L^r(\Omega)}\, ds \\ &\quad + \int_0^t \|\nabla e^{(t-s)(\Delta-1)} \nabla \cdot (u(\cdot,s) c(\cdot,s))\|_{L^r(\Omega)}\, ds. \end{aligned} \tag{3.15}$$

We first obtain the estimate for the first term on the right-hand side of (3.15). Noting that $q > 3$, we derive from the Hölder inequality and [**36**, Lemma 1.3 (iii)] that there exist constants $C_{35}, C_{36} > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla e^{t(\Delta-1)} c_0\|_{L^r(\Omega)} &\le C_{35} \|\nabla e^{t(\Delta-1)} c_0\|_{L^q(\Omega)} \\ &\le C_{36} \|\nabla c_0\|_{L^q(\Omega)}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.16}$$

We next establish the estimate for the second term on the right-hand side of (3.15). Lemmas 3.2 and 3.8 yield that there exist constants $C_{37}, C_{38} > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_0^t \|\nabla e^{(t-s)(\Delta-1)}(\alpha n_1(\cdot,s) + \beta n_2(\cdot,s) + 1) c(\cdot,s)\|_{L^r(\Omega)}\, ds \\ &\le C_{37} \int_0^t [1 + (t-s)^{-\frac{1}{2} - \frac{3}{2}(\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{r})}] e^{-(t-s)} (\|n_1(\cdot,s)\|_{L^p(\Omega)} + \|n_2(\cdot,s)\|_{L^p(\Omega)} + |\Omega|^{\frac{1}{p}})\, ds \\ &\le C_{38} \int_0^t [1 + (t-s)^{-\frac{1}{2} - \frac{3}{2}(\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{r})}] e^{-(t-s)}\, ds. \end{aligned} \tag{3.17}$$

Here, since $\frac{1}{2} + \frac{3}{2}(\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{r}) < 1$, we have

$$\int_0^t [1 + (t-s)^{-\frac{1}{2} - \frac{3}{2}(\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{r})}] e^{-(t-s)}\, ds \le \int_0^\infty (1 + \sigma^{-\frac{1}{2} - \frac{3}{2}(\frac{1}{p} - \frac{1}{r})}) e^{-\sigma}\, d\sigma < \infty. \tag{3.18}$$

Combination of (3.17) and (3.18) derives that

$$\int_0^t \|\nabla e^{(t-s)(\Delta-1)}(\alpha n_1(\cdot,s) + \beta n_2(\cdot,s) + 1) c(\cdot,s)\|_{L^r(\Omega)}\, ds \le C_{39} \tag{3.19}$$

with some constant $C_{39} > 0$. Finally we will deal with the third term on the right-hand side of (3.15). Now we put $\theta \ge r$, $0 < \ell < \frac{1}{2}$ satisfying $\frac{1}{2} + \frac{3}{2}(\frac{1}{\theta} - \frac{1}{r}) < \ell$ and $a \in (0, \frac{1}{2} - \ell)$. Then we derive from [**15**, Section 2] and Lemmas 3.2 and 3.9 that there exist constants

$C_{40}, C_{41}, C_{42} > 0$ and $\lambda > 0$ such that

$$
\begin{aligned}
(3.20)\qquad & \int_0^t \|\nabla e^{(t-s)(\Delta-1)}\nabla\cdot(u(\cdot,s)c(\cdot,s))\|_{L^r(\Omega)}\,ds \\
&\le \int_0^t \|e^{(t-s)(\Delta-1)}\nabla\cdot(u(\cdot,s)c(\cdot,s))\|_{W^{1,r}(\Omega)}\,ds \\
&\le C_{40}\int_0^t \|(-\Delta+1)^{\ell}e^{(t-s)(\Delta-1)}\nabla\cdot(u(\cdot,s)c(\cdot,s))\|_{L^\theta(\Omega)}\,ds \\
&\le C_{41}\int_0^t (t-s)^{-\ell-\frac{1}{2}-a}e^{-\lambda(t-s)}\|u(\cdot,s)c(\cdot,s)\|_{L^\theta(\Omega)}\,ds \\
&\le C_{42}\int_0^t (t-s)^{-\ell-\frac{1}{2}-a}e^{-\lambda(t-s)}\,ds.
\end{aligned}
$$

Noting that $\ell+\frac{1}{2}+a<1$, we infer that there exists a constant $C_{43}>0$ such that

$$
(3.21)\qquad \int_0^t (t-s)^{-\ell-\frac{1}{2}-a}e^{-\lambda(t-s)}\,ds \le \int_0^\infty \sigma^{-\ell-\frac{1}{2}-a}e^{-\lambda\sigma}\,d\sigma \le C_{43}.
$$

From (3.20) and (3.21) we have

$$
(3.22)\qquad \int_0^t \|\nabla e^{(t-s)(\Delta-1)}\nabla\cdot(u(\cdot,s)c(\cdot,s))\|_{L^r(\Omega)}\,ds \le C_{44}
$$

with some constant $C_{44}>0$. Therefore in light of (3.15), (3.16), (3.19) and (3.22) there exists a constant $C_{45}>0$ that

$$
\|\nabla c(\cdot,t)\|_{L^r(\Omega)} \le C_{45}
$$

for all $t\in(0,T_{\max})$. □

Then we will derive the L^∞-estimate for n_i by using the well-known semigroup estimates (see [**2**]).

Lemma 3.11. *Assume $\frac{\chi}{\mu}<\xi_0$. Then there exists a constant $C_{46}>0$ such that*

$$
\|n_i(\cdot,t)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \le C_{46} \quad \textit{for all } t\in(0,T_{\max})
$$

for $i=1,2$.

Proof. We let $q>3$ and let $p\in(\frac{3}{2},2)$ with $\frac{3p}{3-p}<q$. Then thanks to Lemma 3.8, we obtain

$$
\|n_1(\cdot,t)\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \le C_{47}
$$

for all $t\in(0,T_{\max})$ with some $C_{47}>0$. Now we can choose $r\in(3,q)$ such that $p>\frac{3r}{3+r}$ and $\theta>1$ satisfying

$$
\frac{1}{\theta} < \min\left\{1-\frac{r(3-p)}{3p}, \frac{q-r}{q}\right\},
$$

and put $\theta' := \frac{\theta}{\theta-1}$, and then

$$r\theta' < \frac{3p}{3-p} \quad \text{and} \quad r\theta' < q$$

hold. Now for all $T' \in (0, T_{\max})$ we note that

$$M(T') := \sup_{t\in(0,T')} \|n_1(\cdot,t)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}$$

is finite. In order to obtain the estimate for $M(T')$ for all $t \in (0,T')$ we put $t_0 := (t-1)_+$ and represent n_1 according to

$$\begin{aligned} n_1(\cdot,t) &= e^{(t-t_0)\Delta} n_1(t_0) - \int_{t_0}^t e^{(t-s)\Delta} \nabla\cdot(\chi n_1(\cdot,s)\nabla c(\cdot,s) + n_1(\cdot,s)u(\cdot,s))\,ds \\ &\quad + \mu_1 \int_{t_0}^t e^{(t-s)\Delta} n_1(1-n_1-a_1n_2)ds \\ &=: I_1(\cdot,t) + I_2(\cdot,t) + I_3(\cdot,t). \end{aligned}$$

In the case that $t \le 1$, from the order preserving property of the Neumann heat semigroup we know that

$$\|I_1(\cdot,t)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \le \|n_{1,0}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \quad \text{for all } t \in (0, \min\{1,T'\}).$$

In the case that $t > 1$, by using the L^p-L^q estimate for $(e^{\tau\Delta})_{\tau>0}$ (see [**36**, Lemma 1.3 (i)]) and Lemma 3.8 we can see that there exists a constant $C_{48} > 0$ such that

$$\|I_1(\cdot,t)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \le \|n_1(\cdot,t_0)\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \le C_{48} \quad \text{for all } t \in (1,T').$$

Thanks to the elementary inequality

$$\mu_1 n_1(1-n_1-a_1n_2) \le -\mu_1\left(n_1 - \frac{1+\mu_1}{2\mu_1}\right)^2 + \frac{(1+\mu_1)^2}{4\mu_1} \le \frac{(1+\mu_1)^2}{4\mu_1}$$

together with the maximum principle, we see that there exists a constant $C_{49} > 0$ such that

$$I_3(\cdot,t) \le C_{49} \quad \text{for all } t \in (1,T').$$

Next we obtain from the known smoothing property of $(e^{\tau\Delta})_{\tau\ge0}$ (see [**8**]) that

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{t_0}^t \left\| e^{(t-s)\Delta}\nabla\cdot(\chi_1 n_1(\cdot,s)\nabla c(\cdot,s) + n_1(\cdot,s)u(\cdot,s))\right\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} ds \\ &\le C_{50} \sup_{s\in(0,T')} \left(\chi_1 \left\|n_1(\cdot,s)\nabla c(\cdot,s)\right\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} + \left\|n_1(\cdot,s)u(\cdot,s)\right\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}\right) \int_0^1 \sigma^{-\frac{1}{2}-\frac{3}{2r}}\,d\sigma \end{aligned}$$

for all $t \in (0, T')$ with some $C_{50} > 0$. Here we note from $\frac{1}{3} + \frac{3}{2r} < 1$ that $\int_0^1 \sigma^{-\frac{1}{3}-\frac{3}{2r}}\, d\sigma$ is finite. Then we can obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}\|n_1(\cdot,s)\nabla c(\cdot,s)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} &\le \|n_1(\cdot,s)\nabla c(\cdot,s)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \\ &\le \|n_1(\cdot,s)\|_{L^{r\theta}(\Omega)}\|\nabla c(\cdot,s)\|_{L^{r\theta'}(\Omega)} \\ &\le M(T')^{1-\frac{1}{r\theta}}\|n_1(\cdot,s)\|_{L^1(\Omega)}^{\frac{1}{r\theta}}\|\nabla c(\cdot,s)\|_{L^{r\theta'}(\Omega)}\end{aligned}$$

for all $s \in (0, T')$. Noting from $r\theta' < \frac{3p}{3-p}$ that

$$r\theta' \in (3, 6) \cap (1, q],$$

we have from Lemma 3.10 that there exists $C_{51} > 0$ such that

$$\|\nabla c(\cdot,s)\|_{L^{r\theta'}(\Omega)} \le C_{51} \quad \text{for all } s \in (0, T').$$

Therefore we can find $C_{52} > 0$ satisfying

$$\|n_1(\cdot,s)\nabla c(\cdot,s)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \le C_{52} \quad \text{for all } s \in (0, T').$$

Similarly, from Lemma 3.9 there exists a constant $C_{53} > 0$ such that

$$\|n_1(\cdot,s)u(\cdot,s)\|_{L^\theta(\Omega)} \le C_{53}M(T')^{1-\frac{1}{r\theta}}\|n_1(\cdot,s)\|_{L^1(\Omega)}.$$

Therefore, Lemma 3.1 leads to the existence of $C_{54}, C_{55} > 0$ such that

$$n_1(\cdot,t) \le \|I_1(\cdot,t)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} + \|I_2(\cdot,t)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} + I_3(\cdot,t) \le C_{54} + C_{55}M(T')^{1-\frac{1}{r\theta}},$$

which implies from the positivity of n_1 that

$$M(T') \le C_{54} + C_{55}M(T')^{1-\frac{1}{r\theta}}.$$

Noting that $r\theta > 1$, we derive that there exists $C_{56} > 0$ such that

$$M(T') = \sup_{t\in(0,T')} \|n_1(\cdot,t)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \le C_{56} \quad \text{for all } T' \in (0, T_{\max}).$$

Similarly we prove that there exists a constant $C_{57} > 0$ such that $\|n_2(\cdot,t)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \le C_{57}$ for all $t \in (0, T_{\max})$. Therefore we can attain the conclusion of the proof. □

Proof of Theorem 1.1. Combination of Lemmas 2.1, 3.9, 3.10 and 3.11 directly leads to Theorem 1.1. □

4. Stabilization. Proof of Theorem 1.2

4.1. Case 1: $a_1, a_2 \in (0, 1)$

Now we assume that $\frac{\chi}{\mu} < \xi_0$. In this section we will show stabilization in (1.1) in the case $a_1, a_2 \in (0, 1)$. We will prove the key estimate for the proof of Theorem 1.2. The proof is same as that of [**14**, Lemma 4.1].

Lemma 4.1. *Let $a_1, a_2 \in (0,1)$ and let (n_1, n_2, c, u) be a solution to (1.1). Under the assumption of Theorem 1.1, there exist $k_1, \ell_1 > 0$ and $\varepsilon_1 > 0$ such that the nonnegative functions E_1 and F_1 defined by*

$$E_1 := \int_\Omega \left(n_1 - N_1 \log \frac{n_1}{N_1} \right) + k_1 \int_\Omega \left(n_2 - N_2 \log \frac{n_2}{N_2} \right) + \frac{\ell_1}{2} \int_\Omega c^2$$

and

$$F_1 := \int_\Omega (n_1 - N_1)^2 + \int_\Omega (n_2 - N_2)^2$$

satisfy

$$\frac{d}{dt} E_1(t) \le -\varepsilon_1 F_1(t) \quad \text{for all } t > 0, \tag{4.1}$$

where

$$N_1 := \frac{1 - a_1}{1 - a_1 a_2}, \quad N_2 := \frac{1 - a_2}{1 - a_1 a_2}.$$

By using Lemma 4.1 we can show stabilization of n_1, n_2.

Lemma 4.2. *Let $a_1, a_2 \in (0,1)$ and let (n_1, n_2, c, u) be a solution to (1.1). Under the assumption of Theorem 1.1, the solution of (1.1) satisfies the following properties*:

$$\|n_1(\cdot, t) - N_1\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \to 0, \quad \|n_2(\cdot, t) - N_2\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \to 0 \quad \text{as } t \to \infty.$$

Proof. Firstly we can see from Lemmas 3.9, 3.10, 3.11 and [**18**] that there exist constants $C_{58} > 0$ and $\alpha_0 \in (0,1)$ such that

$$\|n_1\|_{C^{\alpha_0, \frac{\alpha_0}{2}}(\overline{\Omega} \times [t, t+1])} + \|n_2\|_{C^{\alpha_0, \frac{\alpha_0}{2}}(\overline{\Omega} \times [t, t+1])} \le C_{58}$$

for all $t \ge 1$. Now we set

$$f_1(t) := \int_\Omega (n_1 - N_1)^2 + \int_\Omega (n_2 - N_2)^2 \ge 0.$$

Then the function f_1 is nonnegative and uniformly continuous. We see from Lemma 4.1 that

$$\int_1^\infty \int_\Omega (n_1 - N_1)^2 + \int_1^\infty \int_\Omega (n_2 - N_2)^2 = \int_1^\infty f_1(t)\, dt \le \frac{1}{\varepsilon_1} E_1(1) < \infty. \tag{4.2}$$

Thus the compactness method ([**14**, Lemma 4.6]) concludes the proof. □

4.2. Case 2: $a_1 \ge 1 > a_2$

In this section we assume that $\frac{\chi}{\mu} < \xi_0$. This section is devoted to obtaining stabilization in (1.1) in the case $a_1 \ge 1 > a_2$. We will give the following lemma for obtaining it. The proof is same as that of [**14**, Lemma 4.3].

Lemma 4.3. *Let $a_1 \geq 1 > a_2$ and let (n_1, n_2, c, u) be a solution to (1.1). Under the assumption of Theorem 1.1, there exist $k_2, \ell_2 > 0$ and $\varepsilon_2 > 0$ such that the nonnegative functions E_2 and F_2 defined by*

$$E_2 := \int_\Omega n_1 + k_2 \int_\Omega (n_2 - \log n_2) + \frac{\ell_2}{2} \int_\Omega c^2$$

and

$$F_2 := \int_\Omega n_1^2 + \int_\Omega (n_2 - 1)^2$$

satisfy

$$\frac{d}{dt} E_2(t) \leq -\varepsilon_2 F_2(t) \quad \text{for all } t > 0. \tag{4.3}$$

By using a similar argument, Lemma 4.3 leads to stabilization of n_1, n_2.

Lemma 4.4. *Let $a_1 \geq 1 > a_2$ and let (n_1, n_2, c, u) be a solution to (1.1). Under the assumption of Theorem 1.1, it holds that*

$$\|n_1(\cdot, t)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \to 0, \quad \|n_2(\cdot, t) - 1\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \to 0 \quad \text{as } t \to \infty.$$

Proof. Noting from Lemma 4.3 that

$$\int_1^\infty \int_\Omega n_1^2 + \int_1^\infty \int_\Omega (n_2 - 1)^2 < \infty, \tag{4.4}$$

we can prove this lemma by the same argument as in the proof of Lemma 4.2. □

4.3. Convergence for c and u

Finally we give the following lemma to establish the decay properties of c and u. We first show the lower estimate for n_2.

Lemma 4.5. *Let $a_2 \in (0, 1)$. Under the assumption of Theorem 1.1, there exist constants $C_{59} > 0$ and $T^* > 0$ such that*

$$n_2(x, t) \geq C_{59} \quad \text{for all } x \in \Omega \text{ and all } t > T^*.$$

Proof. We first deal with the case that $a_1, a_2 \in (0, 1)$. Now, we assume that this lemma does not hold. Then there exist $\{x_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \Omega$ and $\{t_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \subset [0, \infty)$ such that $t_j \to \infty$ as $j \to \infty$ satisfying

$$n_2(x_j, t_j) < \frac{N_2}{2} \quad \text{for all } j \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Thus we have

$$\|n_2(\cdot, t_j) - N_2\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \geq N_2 - n_2(x_j, t_j) > \frac{N_2}{2} \quad \text{for all } j \in \mathbb{N}, \tag{4.5}$$

which means that $n_2(\cdot, t_j)$ does not converge to N_2 as $j \to \infty$. However, Lemma 4.2 asserts that

$$\|n_2(\cdot, t_j) - N_2\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \to 0 \quad \text{as } j \to \infty,$$

which contradicts (4.5). In the case that $a_1 \geq 1 > a_2$ a similar argument leads to the lower estimate for n_2. Therefore we can conclude the proof. □

Lemma 4.6. *Under the assumption of Theorem 1.1, the solution of* (1.1) *satisfies*

$$\|c(\cdot,t)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \to 0, \quad \|u(\cdot,t)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \to 0 \quad \text{as } t \to \infty.$$

Proof. Noting from Lemmas 4.1 and 4.3 that $\int_{T^*}^\infty \int_\Omega (\alpha n_1 + \beta n_2) c^2 < \infty$ and using Lemma 4.5, we can establish that

$$\int_{T^*}^\infty \int_\Omega c^2 < \infty,$$

which entails $\|c(\cdot,t)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \to 0$ as $t \to \infty$. Next we will show that $\|u(\cdot,t)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \to 0$ as $t \to \infty$. Let $\theta \in (\frac{3}{4}, \vartheta)$ and $a = \frac{\theta}{\vartheta} \in (0,1)$. It follows from combination of [**10**, Theorem 3], [**12**, Theorem 1.6.1], [**7**, Part 2, Theorem 14.1] and Lemma 3.9 that there exist constants $C_{60}, C_{61}, C_{62} > 0$ such that

$$\|u\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \le C_{60} \|A^\theta u\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \le C_{61} \|A^\vartheta u\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^a \|A^0 u\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^{1-a} \le C_{62} \|u\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^{1-a},$$

which means that it is sufficient to show that

$$\|u(\cdot,t)\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \to 0 \quad \text{as } t \to \infty.$$

We first note from the Poincaré inequality that there exists a constant $C_{63} > 0$ such that

$$\|u(\cdot,s)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2 \le C_{63} \|\nabla u(\cdot,s)\|_{L^2(\Omega)}^2$$

for all $s \in (0,\infty)$. Put $(n_{1,\infty}, n_{2,\infty}) := (N_1, N_2)$ if $a_1, a_2 \in (0,1)$ or $(n_{1,\infty}, n_{2,\infty}) := (0,1)$ if $a_1 \ge 1 > a_2$. We infer from the fourth equation in (1.1) and the Young inequality that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{dt}\int_\Omega |u|^2 + \int_\Omega |\nabla u|^2 \\
&= \int_\Omega (\gamma(n_1 - n_{1,\infty}) + \delta(n_2 - n_{2,\infty}))\nabla\phi \cdot u + (\gamma n_{1,\infty} + \delta n_{2,\infty}) \int_\Omega \nabla\phi \cdot u \\
&\le \frac{1}{4C_{63}} \int_\Omega |u|^2 + C_{64}\Big(\int_\Omega (n_1 - n_{1,\infty})^2 + \int_\Omega (n_2 - n_{2,\infty})^2 \Big) + (\gamma n_{1,\infty} + \delta n_{2,\infty}) \int_\Omega \nabla\phi \cdot u
\end{aligned}$$

for all $t \in (0,\infty)$ with some constant $C_{64} > 0$. Since $\nabla \cdot u = 0$ in $\Omega \times (0,\infty)$, the functions

$$y(t) := \int_\Omega |u(\cdot,t)|^2 \quad \text{and} \quad h(t) := 2C_{64}\Big(\int_\Omega (n_1 - n_{1,\infty})^2 + \int_\Omega (n_2 - n_{2,\infty})^2 \Big)$$

satisfy

$$y'(t) + C_{65} y(t) \le h(t)$$

with some $C_{65} > 0$. Hence it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
y(t) &\le y(0) e^{-C_{65}t} + \int_0^t e^{-C_{65}(t-s)} h(s)\, ds \\
&\le y(0) e^{-C_{65}t} + \int_0^{\frac{t}{2}} e^{-C_{65}(t-s)} h(s)\, ds + \int_{\frac{t}{2}}^t e^{-C_{65}(t-s)} h(s)\, ds.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.6}$$

Here we see from Lemma 3.11 that there exists a constant $C_{66} > 0$ such that $h(s) \le C_{66}$ for all $s > 0$, and hence we have

$$\int_0^{\frac{t}{2}} e^{-C_{65}(t-s)} h(s)\, ds \le C_{66} e^{-C_{65}t} \int_0^{\frac{t}{2}} e^{C_{65}s}\, ds \le C_{67} e^{-\frac{C_{65}}{2}t} \tag{4.7}$$

with some $C_{67} > 0$. On the other hand, noting from (4.2) and (4.4) that $\int_0^\infty h(s)\, ds < \infty$, we can see that

$$0 \le \int_{\frac{t}{2}}^t e^{-C_{65}(t-s)} h(s)\, ds \le \int_{\frac{t}{2}}^t h(s)\, ds \to 0 \quad \text{as } t \to \infty. \tag{4.8}$$

Therefore combination of (4.6) with (4.7) and (4.8) leads to

$$\|u(\cdot,t)\|^2_{L^2(\Omega)} = y(t) \to 0 \quad \text{as } t \to \infty,$$

which means the end of the proof. □

4.4. Proof of Theorem 1.2

Proof of Theorem 1.2. Lemmas 4.2, 4.4, and 4.6 directly show Theorem 1.2. □

References

[1] X. Bai, M. Winkler, *Equilibration in a fully parabolic two-species chemotaxis system with competitive kinetics*, Indiana Univ. Math. J. **65** (2016), 553–583.

[2] N. Bellomo, A. Bellouquid, Y. Tao, M. Winkler, *Toward a mathematical theory of Keller–Segel models of pattern formation in biological tissues*, Math. Models Methods Appl. Sci. **25** (2015), 1663–1763.

[3] T. Black, *Sublinear signal production in a two-dimensional Keller–Segel-Stokes system*, Nonlinear Anal. Real World Appl. **31** (2016), 593–609.

[4] T. Black, J. Lankeit, M. Mizukami, *On the weakly competitive case in a two-species chemotaxis model*, IMA J. Appl. Math. **81** (2016), 860–876.

[5] X. Cao, *Global classical solutions in chemotaxis(-Navier)-Stokes system with rotational flux term*, J. Differential Equations **261** (2016), 6883–6914.

[6] X. Cao, J. Lankeit, *Global classical small-data solutions for a three-dimensional chemotaxis Navier–Stokes system involving matrix-valued sensitivities*, Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations **55** (2016), Paper No. 107, 39 pp.

[7] A. Friedman, "Partial Differential Equations", Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., New York-Montreal, Que.-London, 1969.

[8] K. Fujie, A. Ito, M. Winkler, T. Yokota, *Stabilization in a chemotaxis model for tumor invasion*, Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. **36** (2016), 151–169.

[9] D. Fujiwara, H. Morimoto, *An L_r-theorem of the Helmholtz decomposition of vector fields*, J. Fac. Sci. Univ. Tokyo Sect. IA Math. **24** (1977), 685–700.

[10] Y. Giga, *The Stokes operator in L_r spaces*, Proc. Japan Acad. Ser. A Math. Sci. **57** (1981), 85–89.

[11] Y. Giga, *Solutions for semilinear parabolic equations in Lp and regularity of weak solutions of the Navier–Stokes system*, J. Differential Equations **61** (1986), 186–212.

[12] D. Henry, "Geometric Theory of Semilinear Parabolic Equations", Lecture Notes in Mathematics, 840, Springer-Verlag, Berlin-New York, 1981.

[13] M. Hieber, J. Prüss, *Heat kernels and maximal L^p-L^q estimate for parabolic evolution equations*, Comm. Partial Differential Equations **22** (1997), 1647–1669.

[14] M. Hirata, S. Kurima, M. Mizukami, T. Yokota, *Boundedness and stabilization in a two-dimensional two-species chemotaxis-NavierStokes system with competitive kinetics*, J. Differential Equations, to appear.

[15] D. Horstmann, M. Winkler, *Boundedness vs. blow-up in a chemotaxis system*, J. Differential Equations **215** (2005), 52–107.

[16] S. Ishida, *Global existence and boundedness for chemotaxis-Navier–Stokes systems with position-dependent sensitivity in 2D bounded domains*, Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. **35** (2015), 3463–3482.

[17] H. Kozono, M. Miura, Y. Sugiyama, *Existence and uniqueness theorem on mild solutions to the Keller–Segel system coupled with the Navier-Stokes fluid*, J. Funct. Anal. **270** (2016), 1663–1683.

[18] O. A. Ladyženskaja, V. A. Solonnikov, N. N. Ural'ceva, "Linear and Quasi-linear Equations of Parabolic Type", AMS, Providence, 1968.

[19] J. Lankeit, *Long-term behaviour in a chemotaxis-fluid system with logistic source*, Math. Models Methods Appl. Sci. **26** (2016), 2071–2109.

[20] J. Lankeit, Y. Wang, *Global existence, boundedness and stabilization in a high-dimensional chemotaxis system with consumption*, preprint.

[21] M. Mizukami, *Remarks on smallness of chemotactic effect for asymptotic stability in a two-species chemotaxis system*, AIMS Mathematics **1** (2016), 156–164.

[22] M. Mizukami, *Boundedness and asymptotic stability in a two-species chemotaxis-competition model with signal-dependent sensitivity*, Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. Ser. B, to appear.

[23] M. Mizukami, T. Yokota, *Global existence and asymptotic stability of solutions to a two-species chemotaxis system with any chemical diffusion*, J. Differential Equations **261** (2016), 2650–2669.

[24] M. Negreanu, J. I. Tello, *On a two species chemotaxis model with slow chemical diffusion*, SIAM J. Math. Anal. **46** (2014), 3761–3781.

[25] M. Negreanu, J. I. Tello, *Asymptotic stability of a two species chemotaxis system with non-diffusive chemoattractant*, J. Differential Equations **258** (2015), 1592–1617.

[26] K. Osaki, T. Tsujikawa, A. Yagi, M. Mimura, *Exponential attractor for a chemotaxis-growth system of equations*, Nonlinear Anal. **51** (Ser. A: Theory Methods) (2002) 119–144.

[27] H. Sohr, "The Navier–Stokes Equations. An Elementary Functional Analytic Approach", Birkhuser Verlag, Basel, 2001.

[28] C. Stinner, J. I. Tello, M. Winkler, *Competitive exclusion in a two-species chemotaxis model*, J. Math. Biol. **68** (2014), 1607–1626.

[29] Y. Tao, M. Winkler, *Eventual smoothness and stabilization of large-data solutions in a three-dimensional chemotaxis system with consumption of chemoattractant*, J. Differential Equations **252** (2012), 2520–2543.

[30] Y. Tao, M. Winkler, *Boundedness and decay enforced by quadratic degradation in a three-dimensional chemotaxis-fluid system*, Z. Angew. Math. Phys. **66** (2015), 2555–2573.

[31] Y. Tao, M. Winkler, *Blow-up prevention by quadratic degradation in a two-dimensional Keller–Segel-Navier–Stokes system*, Z. Angew. Math. Phys. **67** (2016), 67–138.

[32] J. I. Tello, M. Winkler, *Stabilization in a two-species chemotaxis system with a logistic source*, Nonlinearity, **25** (2012), 1413–1425.

[33] I. Tuval, L. Cisneros, C. Dombrowski, C. W. Wolgemuth, J. O. Kessler, R. E. Goldstein, *Bacterial swimming and oxygen transport near contact lines*, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A. **102** (2005), 2277–2282.

[34] Y. Wang, X. Cao, *Global classical solutions of a 3D chemotaxis-Stokes system with rotation*, Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. Ser. B **20** (2015), 3235–3254.

[35] Y. Wang, Z. Xiang, *Global existence and boundedness in a Keller–Segel-Stokes system involving a tensor-valued sensitivity with saturation*, J. Differential Equations **259** (2015), 7578–7609.

[36] M. Winkler, *Aggregation vs. global diffusive behavior in the higher-dimensional Keller–Segel model*, J. Differential Equations **248** (2010), 2889–2905.

[37] M. Winkler, *Global large-data solutions in a chemotaxis-(Navier–)Stokes system modeling cellular swimming in fluid drops*, Comm. Partial Differential Equations **37** (2012), 319–351.

[38] M. Winkler, *Stabilization in a two-dimensional chemotaxis-Navier–Stokes system*, Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal. **211** (2014), 455–487.

[39] M. Winkler, *Boundedness and large time behavior in a three-dimensional chemotaxis-Stokes system with nonlinear diffusion and general sensitivity*, Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations **54** (2015), 3789–3828.

[40] M. Winkler, *Global weak solutions in a three-dimensional chemotaxis-Navier–Stokes system*, Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire **33** (2016), 1329–1352.

[41] M. Winkler, *How far do chemotaxis-driven forces influence regularity in the Navier–Stokes system?*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **369** (2017), 3067–3125.

[42] C. Yang, X. Cao, Z. Jiang, S. Zheng, *Boundedness in a quasilinear fully parabolic Keller–Segel system of higher dimension with logistic source*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. **430** (2015), 585–591.

[43] Q. Zhang, Y. Li, *Convergence rates of solutions for a two-dimensional chemotaxis-Navier–Stokes system*, Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. Ser. B **20** (2015), 2751–2759.